

Construction of Balangir-Khurda Railway Line

3248. SHRI MRUTYUNJAYA NAYAK:
Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is a long standing proposal for construction of Banangir-Phulbani-Khurda railway line on S.E. Railway;

(b) the stage at which the project stands at present; and

(c) the estimated cost thereof and when the work is likely to commence thereon?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI MAL-LIKARJUN): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). A preliminary study carried out in 1985 examined two alternative alignments. The first alignment was without touching Phulbani, 292 km in length, and its cost was assessed at Rs. 274.9 crores. The second alignment via Phulbani with steeper gradient was 363 km long and its cost was Rs. 477.6 crores. The State Government preferred the first alignment which was considerably shorter and cheaper.

Accordingly, a survey was carried out in 1986 and updated in 1991 for the proposed Khurda Road-Balangir new Broad Gauge Railway line without touching Phulbani.

The proposal for taking up this line was sent to the Planning Commission in February, 91 but keeping in view the acute resource constraint and the unremunerative

nature of the project, Planning Commission have not approved taking up of the project.

World Bank Aided Project for Family Welfare Programme

3249. SHRI R. SURENDER REDDY:
Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) whether a World Bank aided project has been launched in Haryana to promote the family welfare programme;

(b) if so, the amount involved thereon.

(c) whether the Government propose to introduce such type of projects in other States also;

(d) if so, the details thereof; and

(e) the total amount sought for implementing the family welfare programmes in all the States, State-wise?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRIMATI D.K. THARADEVI SIDDHARTHA): (a) and (b). Yes; India Population Project-VII (IPP-VII) has been launched in Haryana with the assistance of World Bank w.e.f. 1990-91 to 1994-95 to promote the family welfare programme at a total cost of Rs. 42.42 crores.

(c) and (d). Similar World Bank aided projects have also been launched in a number of other States, details of which are given in the Statement-I enclosed.

(e) A Statement-II giving the State-wise details for 1991-92 is enclosed.

WORLD BANK ASSISTED AREA PROJECTS

| S. No. | Name of the State | State | Name of Districts | Period of Operation | Total project Project cost (Rs. in crores) |
|--------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1. | IPP-III | Kerala | Malappuram, Wynadu, Palghat and Idukki | 1984-92 | 50.33 |
| | | Karnataka | Dharwar, Belgaum, Bijapur Gulbarga, Bidar & Raichur | -do- | 71.31 |
| 2. | IPP-IV | West Bengal | Burdwan, Purulia, Birbhum and Bankara | 1985-93 | 107.47 |
| 3. | IPP-V | Maharashtra | Bombay City | 1988-95 | 48.30 |
| | | Tamil Nadu | Madras City | 1988-95 | 69.10 |
| 4. | IPP-VI | Uttar Pradesh | Entire State | 1990-91- 1994-95 | 110.54 |
| | | Madhya Pradesh | -do- | -do- | 42.75 |
| | | Andhra Pradesh | -do- | -do- | 44.91 |
| | | (NIHW & Min. of Health & F.W.) | -do- | -do- | 1.75 |

| S. No. | Name of the State | State | Name of Districts | Period of Operation | Total project Project cost (Rs. in crores) |
|--------|-------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5. | IPP-VII | Dihar | Entire State | 1990-91- | 88.18 |
| | | Gujarat | -do- | 1994-95 | 43.90 |
| | | Punjab | -do- | -do- | 48.68 |
| | | Haryana | -do- | -do- | 42.42 |
| | | J & K | -do- | -do- | 51.54 |
| | | | | Total: | 274.70 |
| | | National Component (Social Marketing Voluntary Organisations, NIHFV) | | -do- | 61.02 |

STATEMENT-II*Allocation of funds to different States during 1991-92*

| | | <i>(Rs. in Lakhs)</i> |
|-----|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Andhra Pradesh | 4285.99 |
| 2. | Arunachal Pradesh | 104.10 |
| 3. | Assam | 1654.87 |
| 4. | Bihar | 4335.74 |
| 5. | Goa | 100.30 |
| 6. | Gujarat | 2816.75 |
| 7. | Haryana | 1196.96 |
| 8. | Himachal Pradesh | 964.08 |
| 9. | Jammu & Kashmir | 939.06 |
| 10. | Karnataka | 2652.74 |
| 11. | Kerala | 1557.98 |
| 12. | Madhya Pradesh | 4351.79 |
| 13. | Maharashtra | 4780.21 |
| 14. | Manipur | 271.19 |
| 15. | Meghalaya | 186.80 |
| 16. | Mizoram | 118.84 |
| 17. | Nagaland | 132.40 |
| 18. | Orissa | 2380.70 |
| 19. | Punjab | 1417.44 |
| 20. | Rajasthan | 2854.93 |
| 21. | Sikkim | 110.62 |

(Rs. in Lakhs)

| | | |
|-------|---------------|----------|
| 22. | Tamil Nadu | 3602.36 |
| 23. | Tripura | 231.25 |
| 24. | Uttar Pradesh | 8187.70 |
| 25. | *West Bengal | 4790.35 |
| Total | | 54035.15 |

Cadre Review of Para Medical Staff

3250. SHRI MAHESH KANODIA: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government propose to constitute a High Powered Committee to undertake the Cadre Review of the Para Medical Staff under Union Government so as to enhance their pay scales and for opening up of new promotional avenues; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRIMATI D.K. THARADEVI SIDDHARTHA): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Pollution by Rihand Super Thermal Power Project

3251. SHRI BHAGEY GOBAR DHAN: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) the areas of forest land taken over by the Rihand Super Thermal Power Project;

(b) whether the affected people are mainly tribals;

(c) if so, the measures taken by the Government for their rehabilitation;

(d) whether the Project is causing all round pollution beyond permissible limits; and

(e) if so, the steps taken by the Government to check pollution and the outcome thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI KAMAL NATH): (a) 744 hectares.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) Rehabilitation of oustees is to be done as per the norms of the Government and guidelines enunciated by the Supreme Court of India in Writ Petition No. 1061/82 Banwasi Ashram Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh.

(d) No, Sir.

(e) Does not arise.